United Nations CED/C/SR.204

International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance

Distr.: General
17 March 2017

Original: English

Committee on Enforced Disappearances
Twelfth session

Summary record of the 204th meeting
Held at the Palais Wilson, Geneva, on Thursday, 9 March 2017, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. López Ortega (Rapporteur)

Contents

Consideration of reports of States parties to the Convention (*continued*)

Initial report of Ecuador (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of the present record to the Documents Management Section (DMS@unog.ch).

Any corrected records of the public meetings of the Committee at this session will be reissued for technical reasons after the end of the session.

GE.17-03924 (E) 150317 170317

1703924

Please recycle

Mr. López Ortega, Rapporteur, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 10 a.m.

Consideration of reports of States parties to the Convention (*continued*)

Initial report of Ecuador (*continued*) (CED/C/ECU/1; CED/C/ECU/Q/1 and Add.1)

1. *At the invitation of the Chair, the delegation of Ecuador took places at the Committee table.*

2. **Mr. Corcuera Cabezut** (Country Rapporteur) said that he wished to know whether the failure of a refugee to submit an application for asylum within the time frame stipulated by law would, as suggested by paragraph 76 of the State party's replies to the list of issues (CED/C/ECU/Q/1/Add.1), lead to the refoulement of the refugee, regardless of whether there were substantial grounds for believing that he or she would be in danger of being subjected to enforced disappearance. It would be interesting to know what exactly that time frame was and what reasons the State party's authorities had for their seeming belief that requiring refugees to apply for asylum within a given period was fully compatible with the principle of non-refoulement. He wondered whether asylum seekers with provisional refugee status or those who were appealing the rejection of their applications for asylum were placed in migrant or other holding facilities pending the resolution of their appeals.

3. He would welcome confirmation that under the Criminal Code of 2014, prison officials were required to compile and maintain records for persons deprived of their liberty that included all the information mentioned in article 17 (3) of the Convention. An indication of the specific administrative measures that had been taken to ensure compliance with that requirement would be especially welcome. In addition, the delegation should indicate in which article and paragraph of the Code the requirement was established, whether it applied to all facilities where persons were deprived of their liberty, including psychiatric hospitals, juvenile detention centres and others, and whether any officials had been penalized for failing to record a deprivation of liberty or any other pertinent information in registers concerning persons deprived of their liberty.

4. He asked what practical steps had been taken to ensure that all persons deprived of their liberty had access to a lawyer and could communicate with their family or any other person of their choice from the outset of their detention. Merely stating what the law provided for in that regard was insufficiently informative. In that connection, it would be interesting to know whether any officials had been prosecuted for denying persons deprived of their liberty their right to a lawyer or their right to communicate with their relatives or any other person. Information on any specific steps that were taken to safeguard the rights of detainees as they were being released would also be welcome.

5. **Mr. Huhle** (Country Rapporteur) said that he would welcome information on the human rights training given to public officials — the police, for example — other than those working in the judicial system. It would be interesting to know whether that training included information regarding the provisions of the Convention.

6. He requested the delegation to provide additional information on the reparation obtained by the victims of enforced disappearances that had taken place before 2004. He wondered how many victims there had been, what form of reparation they had obtained, why the process of obtaining it had been so slow, whether anyone who had sought reparation had been denied it and, if so, what the reasons for the denial had been. In addition, he asked how many people who had been disappeared before 2004 had been found alive or dead and in how many cases the fate of the disappeared person had not yet been discovered. Information on the methods used to search for and locate disappeared persons would be welcome, as would an account of the efforts that were made to ensure that the remains of any disappeared person that were found were returned to the person's family in a fitting manner.

7. He wished to know how, when and by which authority a decision to initiate a search for a disappeared person was made. It was unclear, for example, on what grounds an investigation into the alleged enforced disappearance of José del Carmen Molano Ríos had been initiated. In the same connection, he requested an explanation of the process whereby

a decision was made as to whether an alleged case of enforced disappearance fell within the scope of the National Directorate for Offences against Life, Violent Death, Disappearance, Extortion and Illegal Confinement.

8. With regard to article 24 (7) of the Convention, he wished to know whether the family members of disappeared persons were placed at a disadvantage when they did not join organizations and associations concerned with attempting to establish the circumstances of enforced disappearances. In addition, he asked whether invitations to the twice-yearly meetings the President of Ecuador held with the family members of disappeared persons were extended to all such family members. More generally, how did the State party intend to maintain contact with those family members?

9. **Mr. Corcuera Cabezut** said that he would welcome an indication of the efforts the State party had made to ensure that no one could be expelled, returned or extradited to another State where there were substantial grounds for believing that he or she would run a personal and foreseeable risk of being subjected to torture, as recommended by the Committee against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT/C/ECU/CO/7, para. 22 (a)). The Ecuadorian authorities should also keep in mind the Committee's concerns about the insecure legal basis of the Ecuadorian national mechanism for the prevention of torture (CAT/C/ECU/CO/7, paras. 15 and 16). In addition, he requested an update on the status of the bill to amend the Office of the Ombudsman Organization Act and asked whether the Ecuadorian authorities were of the view that presuming a victim of enforced disappearance dead, which was provided for in Ecuadorian law, was compatible with article 24 (6) of the Convention.

10. **Ms. Janina** asked what protection Ecuador could afford to refugees or asylum seekers who, because they were deemed a threat to the security of the country, were turned back or refused entry at the border, returned, expelled, extradited or subjected to measures that exposed them to the risk of return to a country in which their life, freedom, safety or security were at risk. She would welcome an explanation of the responsibilities of the two separate bodies that appeared to handle refugee and asylum cases. It would be interesting to know how many cases those bodies handled a year and, in particular, whether there had been any complaints of rejections of applications for refugee status or asylum that had placed the applicant at risk of enforced disappearance.

11. **Mr. Hazan** asked whether the State party was developing capacity in specialized fields, such as forensic genetics and forensic anthropology, that would enable it to identify the remains of persons who might have been disappeared. In addition, he would welcome an explanation of the process whereby military or police intelligence material that could shed light on cases of enforced disappearance was declassified.

12. **The Chair**, speaking as a member of the Committee, asked whether, inasmuch as the definition of "enforced disappearance" in article 2 of the Convention encompassed short-term disappearances, the State party had put in place any mechanisms to ensure that family members were notified whenever detainees were transferred from one facility to another.

The meeting was suspended at 10.30 a.m. and resumed at 10.55 a.m.

13. **Ms. Íñiguez** (Ecuador) said that Ecuador had a larger population of refugees than any other country in Latin America. The country had no refugee camps, however, and prospective refugees were not placed in detention pending the resolution of their applications for refugee status. The Human Mobility Act, which would make it possible to better safeguard the rights of persons in situations of migration, had entered into force in February 2017. Additional information on the administrative and institutional changes the Act had entailed would be submitted in writing in due course.

14. The Act stated that, in exceptional circumstances, the authorities could consider applications for refugee status from applicants who failed to submit applications within the required time frame. The principle of non-refoulement underpinned the work of the relevant Ecuadorian authorities, who were developing protocols for cooperation with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, including in airports, to ensure that that principle was fully respected in Ecuador.

15. **Mr. Tinajero Mullo** (Ecuador) said that all the country's prisons had adopted a new information management system in 2016. Prisons were required to record information about persons deprived of their liberty at the time of admission. The information recorded in the system included the name of the facility and the particular block in which the person was being detained, the date of the person's detention, the crime with which he or she had been charged and details concerning any transfers. Prison wardens and other officials had received training in the use of the new system. Prison personnel who failed to enter the required data were subject to penalties, including dismissal. Police and military barracks were not authorized to operate as detention facilities and, except in cases of flagrante delicto, no one could be detained without a written order from a judge.

16. Protocols for the compilation and maintenance of information on persons admitted to psychiatric hospitals had been developed, although the current focus was on deinstitutionalization and rehabilitation in the community.

17. Under the Criminal Code, all persons newly admitted to a prison were required to undergo a medical examination. The Code also listed the reasons for which a prison warden could order a prisoner's transfer and stated that a judge hearing any case involving a transferred prisoner was to be notified of the transfer immediately. Each prison's social and family reintegration unit notified family members of transfers by telephone. In the case of foreign nationals, the relevant consulates were informed, either by telephone or by mail. In some instances, it was possible for a person deprived of his or her liberty to appeal a transfer order.

18. Since 2008, law enforcement personnel had been required to receive training in human rights, special investigation techniques and crime prevention and control. Courses on human rights were an integral part of the training received not only by aspiring police officers in the country's police academies but also by fully fledged police officers seeking promotion to higher ranks. By 2015, some 96 per cent of the country's police officers had received in-service training on such topics as international human rights standards, the rights of persons deprived of their liberty and the rights of lesbian, gay, transgender and intersex persons. In view of the human rights expertise they had acquired, Ecuadorian law enforcement personnel had provided training to future trainers from the police forces of other Latin American countries. In 2016, in cooperation with the International Committee of the Red Cross, Ecuador had organized a meeting of senior law enforcement officials from across the region to address ways of maintaining public order while fully respecting human rights. Military personnel had received human rights training similar to that received by the police. Human rights were also a cross-cutting component of the curriculum of the recently inaugurated Prison Training Academy, which prepared future prison officers.

19. Persons deprived of their liberty had a constitutional right to communication with and visits from their relatives and legal professionals. Persons being held in pretrial detention were entitled to receive one visit a week, while for convicted prisoners that number varied depending on the level of security of the cell block in which they were held. A regulated prison visiting system, which had involved the development of a web-based appointment book for visitors, had been in place since the introduction of a new prison administration model in 2012. Public defenders were available to detainees who could not afford lawyers of their own. The country's largest prisons had designated time slots during which public defenders were always available for consultation.

20. The Truth Commission had recognized 17 direct victims of enforced disappearance, 5 of whom had later reappeared. The family members of one of the five, who had been placed in witness protection, had reached a non-material reparation agreement with the Ombudsman's Office before his reappearance. In several cases, the family members of the 17 disappeared or formerly disappeared persons had not sought to avail themselves of the Office's voluntary victim redress programme. The family members of four disappeared persons were currently exercising their right to obtain non-material reparation, which could take the specific forms listed in article 6 of the Act on Reparation for Victims and Prosecution of Serious Human Rights Violations and Crimes against Humanity.

21. **Mr. Andino** (Ecuador) said that the National Assembly had been considering since 2014 a bill to replace the Office of the Ombudsman Organization Act with a new act that

would provide a legal framework within which the Office could fulfil its constitutional mandate to act as the Ecuadorian national mechanism for the prevention of torture. The hope was that the new act would be published in the Official Gazette by the end of 2017. Nonetheless, under the Act currently in force, the Ombudsman's Office was required to visit the country's prisons and other facilities to ensure respect for human rights. A protocol for visits had been drawn up to enable the Office to comply with that requirement. The objectives of the Office's visits were to monitor the conditions of detention, produce reports on visits conducted and make recommendations to the relevant authorities. A copy of the protocol, which had been published in the Official Gazette in early 2016, would be forwarded to the Committee in due course.

22. **Mr. de la Vega** (Ecuador) said that the President of Ecuador was under no legal obligation to hold regular meetings with the relatives of disappeared persons but viewed that instead as a moral obligation. One of the goals of the meetings, in which representatives of a number of ministries and other public institutions took part, was to ensure that efforts to resolve cases of enforced disappearance were made in as coordinated and efficient a manner as possible. Since 2013, when the President had begun heading those meetings, some 100 cases had been addressed, and the President himself had requested the establishment of a technical secretariat to deal with them more thoroughly.

23. In response to the question about declassification, he said there were laws that set out specific procedures to be followed by anyone seeking the declassification of sensitive material. The work of the Truth Commission had led to the declassification of hundreds of thousands of documents. In addition, any of the public institutions represented on the country's highest security body, such as the National Council of the Judiciary, could initiate the declassification of classified material as and where necessary.

24. **Mr. Corcuera Cabezut** said that he wished to know exactly how long a person who had entered Ecuadorian territory had to submit an application for refugee status. As he had noted previously, he would welcome a comment on whether the authorities were of the view that requiring such applications to be submitted within a given time frame was compatible with the prohibition of non-refoulement. He asked whether an applicant whose circumstances were not considered sufficiently exceptional under article 100 of the Human Mobility Act would be refused refugee status for no reason other than his or her failure to submit an application within the established time frame. In view of the Committee against Torture's observation (CAT/C/ECU/CO/7, para. 21) that the State party might have engaged in practices contrary to the principle of non-refoulement and that the Regulations on Recognition of the Right to Asylum in Ecuador (Decree No. 1182) permitted exceptions to the principle of non-refoulement, he would welcome an explanation of how the State party evaluated the risks that individual applicants for asylum faced in the countries they had fled.

25. The information provided to the effect that a judge hearing a case involving a prisoner transferred from one prison to another was to be notified of the transfer suggested that the detained person had not yet been convicted. It would be interesting to know who was notified in the case of convicted prisoners. He would welcome a reply from the delegation to his questions on the measures taken by the State party's authorities on a prisoner's release and on whether they believed that legal provisions for presuming the victims of enforced disappearance dead were compatible with the presumption of life implicit in article 24 (6) of the Convention.

26. **Mr. Huhle** asked whether family members of victims of enforced disappearance had ever been excluded from participating in the biannual meeting with the President to review the progress made in each of the cases under investigation. As it was his understanding that, to date, victims of enforced disappearance had only been able to obtain reparation from the State for immaterial damages, he asked whether any victims had attempted to claim compensation for material damages and, if so, whether a claim for such compensation had ever been rejected. He would also be grateful to receive more information on the agreements under which reparation was granted to victims of enforced disappearance, including on the process of negotiation of the agreements between the victims and the State. He asked whether victims of enforced disappearance were given the opportunity to

participate in devising reparation measures and to provide input into the design of memorial projects.

27. **Mr. Corcuera Cabezut** said that it would be useful to know whether persons deprived of their liberty in migration detention centres, juvenile detention centres or psychiatric institutions enjoyed the same procedural guarantees as persons deprived of their liberty in penitentiary or pretrial detention centres. He would also like to hear more about the procedural guarantees available to persons in custody as from the time of their arrest. He asked at what stage the families of persons in custody were informed of their arrest and whereabouts, and wished to know whether those persons had immediate access to a lawyer.

28. **Mr. Decaux** said that it was his understanding that military prisons existed in nearly all countries and that the majority of military barracks had some sort of correctional facility for holding military personnel who had committed minor offences: those both constituted places of deprivation of liberty. He asked whether military prisons and correctional facilities within military barracks were subject to external oversight, whether the Ombudsman's Office had access to those places of detention and whether civilians could be held detained in such places.

29. **Mr. Hazan** asked whether newly declassified documents were publicized and disseminated and whether the families of victims of enforced disappearance were given priority access to those documents. He also wished to know whether it was possible for judges or prosecutors to be granted access to classified documents for the purpose of substantiating a case of enforced disappearance without those documents being declassified.

30. **Ms. Íñiguez** (Ecuador) said that the rights associated with human mobility, such as the right to apply for refugee status, were enshrined in the Constitution, which underpinned the recently adopted Human Mobility Act. The institutional framework for the protection of those rights comprised, inter alia, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Human Mobility, the Directorate General for Refugees, the Subsecretariat for Immigration and the Directorate for the Inclusion of the Foreign Community. The aforementioned institutions worked in partnership to implement the Human Mobility Act.

31. The Government had studied the recent recommendations of the Committee against Torture in respect of practices that the Committee had found to run counter to the principle of non-refoulement, especially at airport border posts, and the exceptions to the principle of non-refoulement in respect of asylum seekers permitted under article 34 of the Regulations on Recognition of the Right to Asylum in Ecuador, and it planned to submit a written response in due course. Ecuador recognized and generally upheld the principle of non-refoulement, although exceptional circumstances did occasionally arise. The statutory time limit for considering an application for refugee status was three months, which could be extended by a further 30 days if more facts were needed to take a decision. The Human Mobility Act laid down several criteria which had to be taken into account when considering an application for refugee status, such as the country's capacity to take in additional refugees, the potential risks facing the applicant and the best interests of the child in the case of unaccompanied minors. Applications for refugee status were considered on an individual basis. Applicants were invited to attend individual interviews where the potential risks facing them could be assessed. None of the costs associated with the application process were borne by the applicant.

32. **Mr. Tinajero Mullo** (Ecuador) said that, if a detained person was to be transferred from one place of detention to another, it was the sentence enforcement judge and not the trial judge who was informed. The Criminal Code assigned sentence enforcement judges the responsibility of monitoring the enforcement of sentences ordered by a competent institution of the social rehabilitation system and required there to be at least one sentence enforcement court in any town where a place of deprivation of liberty was located. The procedural guarantees applicable to detainees who had been released were the same as those applicable to detainees who were subject to transfer.

33. The Act on Reparation for Victims and Prosecution of Serious Human Rights Violations and Crimes against Humanity had established the obligation for the Ministry of Culture and Heritage to begin the process of establishing the Museum of Memory in order to document and pay tribute to the victims of serious human rights violations and crimes

against humanity, including those listed in the final report of the Truth Commission. The Ministry would hold consultations with victims and their families prior to commencing work on the museum to afford them an opportunity to provide input.

34. Responding to the question about external oversight of places of detention, he recalled that, under the Constitution, only persons having received a sentence of deprivation of liberty by reason of a final conviction were to be placed in social rehabilitation centres and that only social rehabilitation and temporary detention centres were part of the social rehabilitation system and were authorized to hold persons deprived of their liberty. Military, police or other barracks were not authorized places for the deprivation of liberty of civilians.

35. **Mr. de la Vega** (Ecuador) said that there was a single social rehabilitation system and that it did not include any sort of military premises. Moreover, members of the armed forces could not be placed in administrative detention; their deprivation of liberty had to be ordered by a competent judicial authority and could only be effected in a suitable place of detention.

36. **Mr. Andino** (Ecuador) said that the Criminal Code likewise provided that only temporary detention and social rehabilitation centres were authorized to hold persons deprived of their liberty. The only other facilities permitted to do so were young offender centres.

37. The Criminal Code authorized sentence enforcement judges to conduct at least one monthly inspection of places of deprivation of liberty to verify the enforcement of the penalty imposed and compliance with the rights of detainees. They were also empowered to order detainees to appear before them for monitoring purposes and to order whatever measures they deemed appropriate to prevent or correct any irregularities observed. He emphasized that only sentence enforcement judges — and not trial judges — had that mandate.

38. The presumption of death of a person reported disappeared was regulated by the Civil Code. Provided that the applicable legal formalities and deadlines had been respected, any interested party could request a declaration of presumed death from the competent judge for the purposes of the adjudication of ownership of the disappeared person's property. The Criminal Code established that, once a person had been reported disappeared, the investigation into his or her disappearance could not be closed until his or her whereabouts became known.

39. **Mr. de la Vega** (Ecuador) said that the current mechanism for dealing with missing persons had not been designed specifically for searching for and locating victims of enforced disappearance. In fact, no case of enforced disappearance had been brought to the Government's attention since the current mechanism had been implemented. All past cases of enforced disappearance had been dealt with by the Truth Commission. None of the cases of missing persons was understood to be attributable to enforced disappearance.

40. Declassified documents were in the public domain and could be accessed, disseminated and used without restriction by interested citizens, civil society and non-governmental representatives for the purposes of substantiating a case. Ecuadorian law provided for the possibility of granting authorized persons access to classified documents for the same purposes on the condition that a chain of custody was established and respected and that the recipient abided by his or her legal obligation not to disseminate the information, on pain of criminal penalty.

41. **Ms. Argüello** (Ecuador) said that the national police training curriculum, which was set by the National Secretariat for Higher Education, Science and Technology, had undergone a major overhaul that had been overseen by an institution with no connection to the national police; input had been received from the Central University of Ecuador. The overhaul of the curriculum coincided with a more wide-ranging reform of police doctrine intended to build the capacity of police officers to guarantee citizens' rights. As a result, both the curriculum and the doctrine included a human rights component.

42. The Constitution and the protocols currently in force established the obligation for the arresting police officer to inform detainees at the time of their arrest of their right to communicate with a family member or with another person of their choice and of the

grounds for their arrest. The arresting officer was also required to inform the public prosecutor of the arrest and to arrange for detainees to undergo a medical examination prior to them being deprived of their liberty.

43. The various institutions providing forensic medicine and forensic science services came under the authority of the Attorney General's Office. Significant efforts had been made to decentralize the aforementioned services and, over the past decade, two new specialized laboratories and eight decentralized forensic centres had been opened. Substantial resources had also been invested in upgrading essential equipment and technology to improve the quality of services rendered. There were currently two forensic anthropologists covering the whole of the national territory. Moreover, staff working in the area of forensic medicine and forensic science services were provided with continuous training. The process of building the country's capacity in that area was expected to continue for several years to come.

44. **Mr. Velasco** (Ecuador) said that the reparation mechanism for victims of enforced disappearance had been established pursuant to the Act on Reparation for Victims and Prosecution of Serious Human Rights Violations and Crimes against Humanity, which had been adopted following the publication of the final report of the Truth Commission. The period preceding the publication of the report had been devoted to documenting cases of serious human rights violations, particularly violations which had occurred between 1984 and 1988. Citizens who considered themselves to be victims of such violations were encouraged to come forward and document their case. The declassification of a large number of documents had allowed many alleged human rights violations to be substantiated. The information gathered had been collated and subsequently published by the Truth Commission. The final report listed individual cases, including the facts of the case, the name of the victims, the rights violated and whether the perpetrators had been identified and brought to justice.

45. Following the publication of the report, the National Assembly had adopted the Act on Reparation for Victims and Prosecution of Serious Human Rights Violations and Crimes against Humanity, whereby the Ecuadorian State recognized its objective responsibility for the human rights violations documented by the Truth Commission and the administrative reparation programme had been introduced. The Ombudsman's Office was responsible for dispensing administrative reparation for immaterial damages to victims of enforced disappearance and their families. Eligible citizens simply needed to approach the Ombudsman's Office to have their identity verified, after which they could benefit from the applicable reparation measures. Participation in the mechanism remained completely voluntary. Compensation for material damages was awarded by a negotiating committee, presided over by the Ministry of Justice, and calculated on the basis of the parameters established by the Act and the Inter-American Court of Human Rights. Victims reserved the right to submit to the negotiating committee other parameters that applied to their case. Victims who were unable to provide documentation to support their claim were entitled to compensation on an equal footing with victims who could. When the negotiating committee and the victim had decided on a settlement figure, a compensation agreement was drawn up and, once it had been ratified, the compensation was immediately payable in cash. No claim for compensation for material damages had ever been rejected. Those victims who had not yet availed themselves of the reparation mechanism were still at liberty to do so.

46. **Mr. Tinajero Mullo** (Ecuador) said that, in several cases, the Attorney General's Office had requested international assistance in locating disappeared persons, such as for conducting DNA analyses and in reconstructing the facts of a given case. In 2013, the Office had ordered an unannounced inspection of police archives which were found to contain information that had helped clarify various cases of enforced disappearance. It had ordered a second such inspection of police archives in 2015, which had uncovered information on various cases of enforced disappearance, including cases investigated by the Truth Commission and Human Rights Directorate. The information gathered had been transmitted to the national archives for classification and preservation and had been used to shed light on serious human rights violations and to identify those responsible.

47. **Mr. Corcuera Cabezut** said that he wished to thank the delegation for the openness, cordiality and respectfulness with which it had participated in the interactive dialogue with

the Committee and for the wealth of information that it had provided. The Committee greatly appreciated the multidisciplinary composition of the delegation, which had enhanced the quality of the dialogue. Given that the Committee had only a short time in which to draft its concluding observations, it would be helpful if those members of the delegation wishing to submit additional information in writing within 48 hours could make their written submissions as succinct as possible to facilitate that task.

48. **Mr. Huhle** said that the conclusion of the consideration of the State party's initial report did not spell the end of the dialogue between the Committee and the State party. The Committee looked forward to receiving supplementary information in writing and wished to remind the State party that the Committee's concluding observations would include recommendations with a fixed time frame for implementation, after which it should report on the steps that it had taken to act upon the recommendations in question. He hoped that the State party would approach its future interactions with the Committee in the same spirit of cooperation and openness.

49. **Mr. de la Vega** (Ecuador) said that it had been a privilege for his delegation to meet with the Committee to discuss the complex issue of enforced disappearance and that he was grateful to its members for having created the conditions for an open, dynamic and flexible dialogue.

50. Over the preceding decades, Ecuador had made great strides towards development in all spheres, as indicated by its falling homicide rate and a marked reduction in inequality. The Government of Ecuador recognized the need to adopt robust policies, plans and programmes to support the implementation of its revised legal framework in order to prevent it from remaining dead letter. It was also aware of the need to continue consolidating its newly established institutional structures.

51. The Government of Ecuador viewed the consideration of its initial report as the beginning of a permanent, ongoing dialogue with the Committee. It also welcomed the opportunity to learn from the experiences and best practices of the Committee and other States parties. While the Government of Ecuador did not consider enforced disappearance to be a widespread phenomenon in its national territory, it remained committed to building its capacity to address that phenomenon. However, it maintained that monitoring mechanisms alone would not be sufficient to eradicate the scourge of enforced disappearance. The key to doing so lay in changing the structures that had allowed it to occur in the first place and in changing the attitudes of public servants, including members of the judiciary, the national police and the armed forces. The Government of Ecuador had made significant efforts towards achieving that goal, as demonstrated by the overhaul of the national police and armed forces training curriculum and the inclusion of a human rights component therein. In addition, the national security doctrine had undergone a radical transformation and now prioritized citizens' welfare over national interests; that had paved the way for significant structural changes within the national police, previously considered to be an offshoot of the armed forces and not an institution mandated to serve the community. Such structural changes had undoubtedly helped preclude the commission of enforced disappearance.

52. **The Chair** said that he wished to express his gratitude to the delegation on behalf of the Committee for what had been a productive, fruitful and constructive dialogue on the occasion of the consideration of the initial report of Ecuador. He looked forward to continuing the interactive dialogue with the State party in the future.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.